<u>REMARKS</u>

Now pending in the application are claims 1-50. Claims 37-50 were withdrawn from further consideration in response to the Examiner's restriction requirement dated June 30, 2006. Applicants thank the Examiner for rejoining claims 37-50 in the Office Action due to the lack of a search burden (Office Action at page 2).

Amongst claims 1-36, claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45 are independent. Claims 1-50 stand rejected. Claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45 are amended herein to expedite prosecution. Support for the amendment may be found at least in the present application at page 34, lines 4-21 and page 40, lines 10-19. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding rejections and urge that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A   Rejections in view of Lett

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-23, 25-30, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over International Patent Application No. 2002/099736 to Lett (hereafter "Lett"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully urge that Lett does not disclose or suggest at least ***persistently storing a simulation context of the simulation by registering an area of memory that constitutes the simulation context, the simulation context comprising one or more values for one or more attributes, the one or more values being established during the simulation of the block diagram model, the persistently storing making the simulation context available after the simulation finishes so that the simulation may be restored to a state consistent with the simulation context***, as recited in independent claims 1, 12, 22, and 28.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner recognizes that the Lett reference "does not explicitly teach storing a simulation context of the simulation by registering an area of memory that constitutes the simulation context ..." (Office Action at page 4). However, the Examiner asserts that "the entire simulation process taught by Lett is performed and stored on a computer

[p.11-12], and Lett calculates variables throughout the simulation process during the simulation of a block diagram model" (Office Action at page 4).   The Examiner appears to argue that the claim feature of ***storing a simulation context of the simulation by registering an area of memory that constitutes the simulation context*** is inherent to the Lett reference because Lett calculates variables related to the simulation, which are "stored" temporarily in RAM.

However, amended independent claims 1, 18, 22, and 28 include <u>persistently storing</u> the simulation context , ***the persistently storing making the simulation context available after the simulation finishes so that the simulation may be restored to a state consistent with the simulation context***.

Lett does not <u>persistently store</u> simulation context so that the simulation context is available <u>after a simulation finishes.</u> Using the Examiner's example, Lett is (at best) calculating each variable as the variable is needed and temporarily storing the variable a non-persistent storage. Thus, after the simulation completes, the variables no longer persist. This is not the same as <u>persistently storing</u> a simulation context to ***make the simulation context available after the simulation finishes so that the simulation may be restored to a state consistent with the simulation context,*** as recited in the present independent claims.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Lett does not disclose or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claims 1, 12, 22, and 28. Claims 2-3 and 5-11 depend from claim 1; claims 13-14 and 16-21 depend from claim 12; claims 23 and 25-27 depend from claim 22; and claims 29-30 and 32-36 depend from claim 28. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-23, 25-30, and 32-36 be withdrawn.

B.   <u>Rejections in view of Lett, Fox, and Potts</u>

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lett, and further in view of International Patent Application No. WO 2003/042857 to Fox (hereafter "Fox"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,882,940 to Potts (hereafter "Potts"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45 include *persistently storing a simulation context of the simulation by registering an area of memory that constitutes the simulation context, the simulation context comprising one or more values for one or more attributes, the one or more values being established during the simulation of the block diagram model, the persistently storing making the simulation context available after the simulation finishes so that the simulation may be restored to a state consistent with the simulation context*. As noted above, Lett does not disclose or suggest at least this feature. Applicants respectfully urge that that Potts also does not disclose or suggest at least the above feature of claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45.

Fox is generally concerned with methods for inferring a network model of the interactions of biological molecules (Fox at Abstract). Fox is not concerned with a simulation context, and does not disclose *persistently storing a simulation context of the simulation by registering an area of memory that constitutes the simulation context, the simulation context comprising one or more values for one or more attributes, the one or more values being established during the simulation of the block diagram model, the persistently storing making the simulation context available after the simulation finishes so that the simulation may be restored to a state consistent with the simulation context*, as recited in independent claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45. Indeed, the Examiner relies on Fox only for "alternatively modeling a chemical reaction" (Office Action at pages 5-6).

Potts is generally concerned with monitoring, for example, glucose values in order to predict a hypoglycemic event in a subject (Potts at Abstract). Accordingly, Potts is not concerned with a simulation context, and does not disclose *persistently storing a simulation context of the simulation by registering an area of memory that constitutes the simulation context, the simulation context comprising one or more values for one or more attributes, the one or more values being established during the simulation of the block diagram model, the persistently storing making the simulation context available after the simulation finishes so that the simulation may be restored to a state consistent with the simulation context*, as recited in independent claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45. Indeed, the Examiner relies on Potts only for user-settable thresholds and functionality for generating an alert when the thresholds are exceeded (Office Action at pages 5-6).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Lett and Potts, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claims 1, 12, 22, 28, 37, and 45. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, claims 13-21 depend from claim 12, claims 23-27 depend from claim 22, claims 29-36 depend from claim 28, claims 38-44 depend from claim 37, and claims 46-50 depend from claim 45. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-50 be withdrawn.

II.   Provisional Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1, 12, 22, and 28 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 3 of copending Application No. 10/783552 in view of Rice. As the rejection is a provisional rejection, Applicants will submit a Terminal Disclaimer, if necessary, when a final version of the claims is agreed upon.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe that the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-109RCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: July 27, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

                                                       Electronic signature: /Kevin J. Canning/
                                                       Kevin J. Canning
                                                       Registration No.: 35,470
                                                       LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
                                                       One Post Office Square
                                                       Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
                                                       (617) 227-7400
                                                       (617) 742-4214 (Fax)
                                                       Attorney/Agent For Applicant